01/2027 EM

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN FRANCISCO

WHEREAS, on February 10, 2010, Plaintiffs Joe M. Groussman and Angelo W. Orlando ("Plaintiffs") brought suit under the Employer Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 ("ERISA") alleging, among other things, that Motorola, Inc. and certain individuals breached their fiduciary duties with respect to the Motorola, Inc.'s 401K Plan ("Plan"), particularly with regard to the Plan's investments in Motorola, Inc.'s common stock (the "Litigation");

WHEREAS; the Litigation, entitled Joe M. Groussman and Angelo W. Orlando v. Motorola, Inc. et al., is pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, Case No. 1:10-CV-0091;

WHEREAS, on October 28, 2011, Plaintiffs issued a subpoena for testimony on December 16, 2011 and documents to a third-party, Padmasree Warrior ("Ms. Warrior"), a resident in the Northern District of California, through this Court ("Subpoena");

WHEREAS, Ms. Warrior timely objected to the Subpoena on November 11, 2011, by filing objections with this Court;

WHEREAS, counsel for Plaintiffs and counsel for Ms. Warrior engaged in meet and confer efforts regarding the Subpoena, and while they could not reach a consensus with regard to the scope of the Subpoena, they agreed to reschedule Ms. Warrior's deposition to February 3, 2012;

WHEREAS, Ms. Warrior intends to move for a protective order under Rule 26(c) of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure to prohibit her deposition and, in the alternative, limit her deposition on the grounds that when she was the Chief Technology Officer of Motorola, Inc., over four years ago, she had no involvement with either the administration of the Plan or its assets, she is currently the Chief Technology Officer of Cisco Systems, Inc., and it is unduly burdensome to depose her as the parties can readily obtain whatever information she may possess from one another in the underlying litigation;

WHEREAS, counsel for Plaintiffs and counsel for Ms. Warrior have met and conferred about the hearing date and briefing schedule for Ms. Warrior's motion for protective order and, subject to the Court's approval, have agreed to modify the notice and briefing schedule set forth in the Northern District of California Local Rules 7-2 and 7-3 to accommodate further

ł		
1	meet and confer efforts;	
2	WHEREAS, Plaintiffs and Ms. Warrior consent to having Ms. Warrior's motion	
3	for protective order heard by a magistrate judge;	
4	NOW THEREFORE, Plaintiffs and Ms. Warrior agree and, through their	
5	respective attorneys, STIPULATE AS FOLLOWS:	
6	That Ms. Warrior's deadline to file and serve her motion for protective order is	
7	Wednesday, January 4, 2012; that Plaintiffs' deadline to file and serve an opposition to Ms.	
8	Warrior's motion for protective order is Wednesday, January 11, 2012; Ms. Warrior's deadline to	
9	file and serve a reply is Wednesday, January 18, 2012; and the Parties are available for hearing, at	
10	the Court's convenience, between January 19, 2012 and February 2, 2012.	
11		
12	Dated: December 28, 2011 MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP	
13	Moreoni, ELVIS & Bookies ELI	
14	By Sin Off	
15	Lorelei Craig Attorneys for Third-Party Respondent	
16	Pasmasree Warrior	
17		
18	Dated: December 22, 2011 SQUITIERI & FEARON, LLP	
19	1.50	
20	By Joseph Goljan With Permis, Joseph Goljan Of Cours &	72
21	Joseph Goljan J Of Couns & Attorneys for Plaintiffs Joe M. Broussman	1
22	and Angelo W. Orlando	
23	(BBOBOSED) ODDED	
24	[PROPOSED] ORDER	
25 26	After consideration of the Parties' Stipulation and good cause having been shown,	
27	THE COURT HEREBY ORDERS AS FOLLOWS:	
1	That Ms. Warrior's deadline to file and serve her motion for protective order is	
28 IS & P AW	2.	

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO

1	Wednesday, January 4, 2012; that Plaintiffs' deadline to file and serve an opposition to Ms.
2	Warrior's motion for protective order is Wednesday, January 11, 2012; Ms. Warrior's deadline to
3	file and serve a reply is Wednesday, January 18, 2012; and Ms. Warrior's motion for protective
4	order shall be heard on
5	
6	Dated:
7	Ву
8	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
9	JUDGE
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
MORGAN, LEWIS &	_
BOCKIUS LLP ATTORNEYS AT LAW SAN FRANCISCO	3. STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER SHORTENING TIME TO BRING THIRD-PARTY PADMASREE
	WARRIOR'S MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

PROOF OF SERVICE 1 Joe M. Grousmann, et al. v. Motorola, Inc. et al. 2 United State District Court for the Northern District of California Misc. Case No. 3 and Case No, 1:10-CV-0091 (Pending in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Illinois) 4 I am a resident of the State of California and over the age of eighteen years, and not a 5 party to the within action; my business address is One Market, Spear Street Tower, San Francisco, CA 94105. On December 28, 2011, 6 I served the within documents: 7 STIPULATION AND [PROPOSED] ORDER SHORTENING TIME TO 8 BRING THIRD-PARTY PADMASKEE WARRIOR'S MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER 9 10 X by placing the document(s) listed above in a sealed envelope with postage thereon fully prepaid, in the United States mail at San Francisco, California addressed as 11 set forth below. 12 13 VIA USPS VIA USPS 14 Joseph Goljan Ian H. Morrison Squitieri & Fearon, LLP Ada W. Dolph 15 32 East 57th Street SEYFARTH SHAW LLP 16 12th Floor 131 South Dearborn Street, Suite 2400 Chicago, Illinois 60603 New York, New York 10022 17 18 I am readily familiar with the firm's practice of collection and processing correspondence for mailing. Under that practice it would be deposited with the U.S. Postal 19 Service on that same day with postage thereon fully prepaid in the ordinary course of business. 20 I declare under penalty of perjury under the laws of the State of California and the United States of America that the foregoing is true and correct. 21 Executed on December 28, 2011, at San Francisco, California. 22 23 24 25 26 27

28
MORGAN, LEWIS &
BOCKIUS LLP
ATTORNEYS AT LAW
SAN FRANCISCO

DB2/20876330.1